

REMARKS

[0001] Claims 1-40 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,781,739 to Bach et al. (hereinafter Bach '739). Claims 1, 2, 20, 29, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application 2004/0054969 to Chiang et al. (hereinafter Chiang). Claims 3-6, 12-15, 21-24, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang and U.S. Patent 6,141,660 to Bach et al. (hereinafter Bach '660). Claims 7-8, 16-18, 25-26, and 34-35 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang, in view of Bach '660 and U.S. Patent Application 2002/0078255 to Narayan. Claims 9, 27, and 36 are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of U.S. Patent 6,560,639 to Dan et al. (hereinafter Dan). Claims 10, 28, and 37 are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of U.S. Patent Application 2004/0230987 to Snover et al. (hereinafter Snover). Claims 19 and 38 are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang, Bach '660, and Bach '739.

[0002] Applicants seek to determine through this interview what aspects are objectionable and what agreements can be reached, particularly with respect to the proposed claim amendments.

[0003] The amended independent Claims 1, 12, 20, 29, 39, and 40 clarify that the limitations taught in the present invention that are not taught by Bach '739 nor Chiang, such that the Claims are allowable over § 102(a). The amendments specify accepting a parameter set provided as a single input through an interface. This represents a significant improvement over the prior art, allowing the construction of the necessary

components for multiple MFS-based IMS applications at a single time, as opposed to performing the entry individually for each application.

[0004] Applicants also wish to discuss with the Examiner the validity of the Chiang reference as to the §103(a) rejections. Specifically, Chiang is not valid art for use in a 103(a) rejection against the present invention. As noted in the Office Action, Chiang qualifies as prior art under subsection (e) of §102. The subject matter of Chiang, as of the date the invention of the present application was made, was owned by I.B.M., as was the claimed invention. As such, under 103(c) Chiang does not preclude patentability of the claimed invention under 103(a).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 20, 2007

Kunzler & McKenzie
8 E. Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: 801/994-4646

/David J. McKenzie/

David J. McKenzie
Reg. No. 46,919
Attorney for Applicants